



November 6, 2002

Mr. Scott Gibson  
Enforcement Attorney  
Texas Board of Architectural Examiners  
P. O. Box 12337  
Austin, Texas 78711-2337

OR2002-6332

Dear Mr. Gibson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 171875.

The Texas Board of Architectural Examiners (the "board") received a request for copies of complaints made to the board in regard to a specified architect. You state that the requestor subsequently clarified that she was also requesting copies of final orders or other documents resolving the complaints. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (stating that when governmental bodies are presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). You state that you have provided the requestor with some responsive information. You claim, however, that the remaining requested information, which you have highlighted, is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

You claim that the highlighted information before us is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.<sup>1</sup> The common-law informer's privilege has long been recognized by Texas courts and is incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *see also Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988),

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101.

208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege also protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *See* Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute carrying a civil or criminal penalty. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988).

You state that the board has previously received complaints concerning the specified architect alleging violations of the Architects' Registration Act, article 249a of Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes ("V.T.C.S."). *See* V.T.C.S. art. 249a. We note that a violation of article 249a of V.T.C.S. carries potential criminal penalties. *See* V.T.C.S. art. 249a, § 13. Based on our review of your arguments and the highlighted information at issue, we agree that the disclosure of portions of this information would tend to identify the informants in these matters. Accordingly, we conclude that the board may withhold the identifying information of the informants that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, the board must release the remaining highlighted information to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records;


2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJB/lmt

Mr. Scott Gibson - Page 4

Ref: ID# 171875

Enc. Marked documents

cc: M. Calley D. Callahan  
Knolle & Holcomb  
6805 Capital of Texas Highway  
North, Suite 330  
Austin, Texas 78731  
(w/o enclosures)